

With. Bookly

A 14

VINDICATION

Of my Lord Bishop of Worcester's

LETTER

TOUCHING

Mr. *Baxter* from the Animadver-
sions of *D. E.*

(Edw. Bagshaw)



Sept 310

L O N D O N,

Printed for *Henry Herringman*, at the Anchor in the
lower walk of the New-Exchange.

Anno 1662.

Union Theol. Sem. Library

MCALPIN

1662

+Y43



Received 5/7/31 v/- (2107)



A

VINDICATION

Of my Lord Bishop of Worcester's Letter touching Mr. Baxter from the Animadversions of D. E.

I Expected, when I first saw these Animadversions, that my Lord Worcester's Relation touching his carriage to Mr. Baxter, had been false in many particulars, and in all partial; for I could hardly believe any Ingenuous person could write so sharply against a Father of our Church, if he did not believe that he had truth on his side, as to the main occasion of the Bishop's Letter. But I confesse, I was much amazed, when I found our Animadvector, not only silent as to the main businesse, but of my Lord Bishop's opinion as to the Controversy, if Dr. Gunning, and Dr. Pearson state it right. And yet he is so angry, that through all this discourse, he gives the Bishop not one civil Epithere, never calls him Lord, but taxeth him of testiness & choler, of malicious & ill-grounded fancy, of unpeaceableness & virulency, of trifling with Scripture, of boldnesse & impiety. And that this worthy Prelate might not go alone, he calls the Imposers of Ceremonies unconscionable, and so joyns all our Bishops with him. I never yet, to deal

ingenuously, saw so much choler in so few words come from the pen of any person, much lesse from one, whose judgement, as he tells us, is for the Order of Bishops, from one who ever opposed the Covenant, and is a zealous lover of the King.

I am now more fully confirmed in my former opinion, that my Lord Bishops Letter is unanswerable, since our Animadverſor strives rather to pick a quarrel with it, than to answer it. He had certainly a very great desire of writing, or a very great animosity against this Bishop in publishing of his Animadversions, since he knew before he writ them, that as to the Controversy, the Bishop was right, and only here and there takes out a passage, which he thinks may afford some dispute. How well he hath done this, this ensuing Discourse shall evidence.

The first Exception he takes at the Bishop is, that he supposeth so strict an union, and inseparable dependence between Kings and Bishops, that they must stand and fall together. ——— I am glad he confesseth the event of this War is some advantage to this Position: But I believe if he looks but about him, he will hardly find any that opposed their Bishop but did their Prince, as soon as they had power to do it. He means not, I suppose, in his Answer to this Axiom, the Anabaptistical or Fanatick party, the *Munster* Rebellion will sufficiently shew, their Principles, by their practices. And as for the Presbyterians, for them the World esteems the most sober of our dissentors, (although I am fully of Arch-Bishop *Whitgifts* opinion, that they differ in nothing from them, but length of time, because the consequences of their Positions do naturally carry them to the Anabaptists) I wish I could ever find their Government in any place established, but upon a War, but upon Arms against their lawful Magistrates. He that should hear of *Zwinglius* killed fighting, of *Beza's* trouting under the Banner of the Prince of *Conde*, of the *Genevans* expelling their Bishop and lawfull Prince, of the *Hugonots* fighting in *France* against their lawful King, of the *Dutch* subverting their Monarchical Government into a Commonwealth, of the *Scots*, to name no more, expelling their lawful *Q. Mary*; He that considers who first taught the lawfulness of taking Arms for Religion, invented the distinction of Offensive and Defensive Arms, and who generally teach the People, that the whole Power and Government is in them, will easily believe, that their Principles are inconsistent with Monarchy, which hath produced such fatal effects throughout this part of the World. But this by the way; his first Reason why this Axiom is not true, is,

1. Because Kings were in all parts of the World before Bishops, and what hath been may be---I understand not at all how this is argumentative, because there were Kings before there was any Christian Church, and so

so consequently before Bishops, therefore when there is a Christian Church Kings can subsist without Bishops: for whilst the World was Heathen, we find a Monarchy amongst their Priests, a superiority and an inferiority evidently amongst them, and so though there were not Bishops, yet it was necessary to have something that resembled them. Amongst the Jews we find three distinctions of Clergy, High-Priest, Priest, and Levites, established by God himself, which is a very probable Argument they were necessary to uphold a Monarchy, for they were necessary to uphold the Jewish Church, or else they had not been instituted. I could not have believed, that a person that seems Learned, could have thought that Axiom reached further, than since the World was Christian. But if he only means, since the World was Christian, why doth he not assign some Monarchy that subsisted with Presbytery, I think he can name none but *Scotland*, which how long it kept from a Rebellion, after Presbytery was by Law there established, the Animadvertor knows as well as I do.

2. His second Reason is, because Bishops as they are by Law established in *England*, are purely the King's subordinate Ministers for the management of Ecclesiastical affairs. ——— This I think is more invalid than the former: for allowing what he saith to be true, which I am sure is not, I do not understand, why because the Bishops are the Kings Officers, therefore there is not a necessity of Episcopacy in a Monarchy, nay rather it inforceth the contrary, for it demonstrates that Kings ever judged Episcopacy necessary to Monarchy by alwayes constituting such Officers to Govern the Church under them. Our Animadvertor would do well to assign a King that put down Episcopacy, upon his own free will and consent, without the force of the people, and settled up any other Ecclesiastical Government, with which the Monarchy did better subsist. But besides his Position is false: for the Law of *England* doth not look upon the Bishops meerly as Ecclesiastical Officers, but as a third Estate, without whose consent no Act of Parliament did legally pass, unless they did voluntarily exclude themselves; and that they are a third Estate several Acts of Parliament expressly call them so. Secondly, All Bishops are to be considered in a double capacity: First, As Officers instituted by *Christ*, and so the Power of Church Censures belongs to them, and this Power our Kings never pretended to, to have, neither doth our Law any where tell you, that this Authority the King gives them. Secondly, As Officers appointed by the King to exercise that former power given them by God within such bounds and limits. And many times our Law gives the Bishop much power in the Secular affairs, which will conduce to the good of the State as well as the Church; which Power they derive not from *Christ*, but from the Secular Magistrate. Now when the

the Magistrate is Christian, it is necessary that the limits of each Bishops Jurisdiction be determined by him, but were the Magistrate Heathen, the Church had that power to prescribe the limits of each Bishop, as we see they did in the first 300. years after Christ, and we find no Christian all that time ever question them. And the reason is evident, because Christ that left the Bishops the Successors of the Apostles, Governours of the Church, could not but give them sufficient Power to do all things which was necessary to the peace, increase, and ædification of the Church, which certainly the appointing of limits for each Bishop to act in must necessarily conduce.

But in the third place, I understand not how our Animadvertor agrees with himself, when he tells us the King may conferr the management of Ecclesiastical affairs upon Lay Men, & calls the Episcopal power undue Dignity and Pralation of his inferiour Officers, and yet some few lines before says his judgement is much for the Order of Bishops. If he be for the Order of Bishops, he must believe they have a power from Christ which no earthly man can either give or take from them; but I believe he mistook himself, or else he would not use such uncharitable Epithetes of their whole Order, in calling it undue Dignity, and as some Antichristian. There is nothing more in these words but what before is answered.

His third Reason against this Union is worst still. Because it will be found none hath been greater Enemies to the undoubted Sovereignty of Princes than some Bishops have been ———— Ergo Episcopacy and Monarchy are not necessarily united. I would in answer to this desire our Animadvertor to name me any sort of Men that are necessary to a Monarchy, and let him examine himself whether this Argument is not against them. There are by Historians esteemed two Foundations of Monarchy, Nobility or Arms: and have not many Noble-men, which should be support of Monarchies, been the ruin of them? Witnesse the Barons Warrs, what necessities were several of our Kings brought into by them? And how often do we read in story of Armies deposing one Prince and setting up another? So that this Argument is as strong against any sort of Men, that a Monarchy makes use of, as against Bishops. But now to use *Argumentum ad hominem*, [for I confesse I cannot esteem our Animadvertor a friend to Bishops, though he sayes he is, since he useth no civiler language to one of them than to say the Pope is his Father.] Is that party that call the Dignity of Bishops Antichristian less Enemies to Sovereign Power than some Bishops have been? I believe whosoever shall read the Ecclesiastical History of *Scotland*, written by Archbishop *Sposwood*, or shall but hear an impartial Relation of the Barbarous and unchristian usage of our present King, when he was there, will be soon convinced, there never were a Generation of Clergy so Antimonarchical, as that Nation hath produced, amongst the Presbyterian party. I

I think now I have sufficiently overthrown his Arguments against the Union of Monarchy and Episcopacy, It still remains as firm as before. Yet I would not be mistaken, 'tis possible a Monarchy may subsist without Episcopacy; for we may fancy all people so peaceable and just, as that a Nation may subsist without Laws. But that Axiom doth mean that Episcopacy is necessary to the well-being of a Monarchy, not simply to the being of it, that the Church under a Monarchy can no wayes be prudently governed but by Bishops, nor the King can no way have that influence over the inferiour Clergy as by the Bishops. I speak here only in reference to the State. But as to the Church, Bishops are an Order so necessary, that I doubt it will puzzle our Animadvertor, or any person whatsoever to prove any Ordination but by their hands lawful in any case whatsoever.

His second Exception against this Reverend Prelate is, that he is the sole Pastor of all the Congregations in his Diocese ——— I could hardly believe our Animadvertor wanted Ingenuity before: For where doth my Lord Worcester say, he is the sole Pastor of all the Congregations in his Diocese? The Bishops words are these, For it is the Bishop of Worcester, and not Mr. Baxter, that is Pastor of Kederminster, as well as of all other Parochial Churches in that Diocese. For there is much difference between my Lord Bishop's saying, he is the Pastor, and the sole Pastor: for the Bishop is the Overseer, and chief Pastor, not only of all the Congregations, but of all the Pastors in his Diocese, and Mr. Baxter was not by any right present Pastor there, and had no relation at all to that Parochial Church, as in his third Excep. I shall make appear. So that this angry confirmation of the Justice of his Exception falls to the ground. But let us follow him. If this be defensible 'tis only by those Arguments which are commonly alleged to maintain the Popes Supremacy over all Churches whatsoever. For, since a Bishop can no other way discharge his duty herein but by providing Substitutes, what hinders but that the Bishop of Rome may oversee a Million of Churches as the Bishop of Worcester 500? This illustration I think was purposely chosen to sling dirt in this Bishops face, that the World might suppose Prelacy & Popery go hand in hand, as their Covenant joyns them. But we must allow Ill words, from those that write little Reason. This is grounded absolutely upon a false Hypothesis, for here it must be supposed that every Bishops chief work is to feed his people, where his work is to govern, to see that the inferiour Clergy over his Diocese do their duty, & teach therein sound Doctrine. And this work as it is more honourable, so it is far more labourious. Neither is there the least correspondence between 500, and a Million of Parishes, because the account of the one may easily be done, the other is impossible. Besides, 'tis quite a different thing the Popes claim and our Bishops, for the Pope claims to be

Uni-

Universal Bishop, the only Successor of the Apostles, and that Christ hath left him sole Governour of the Church, and that all other Bishops derive their power solely from him; whereas our Church teacheth, according to the Opinion of the ancient Fathers, as were it necessary I could shew you, that the Power of each Bishop is alike, and as to their Precincts and Jurisdiction, the Governours of the Church under persecution appointed more or fewer, according as the place required, and ever since, what alterations have been made in their limits, have been done by Civil Magistrates, to whose care it belongs, as Governours of the Church, to see that each Bishop performs his duty.

But let us follow him to his Proofs, letting alone his unnecessary parenthesis; his first is *Act. 10. 28.* when *Paul* sent for the Elders of the Church at *Ephesus*, he bids them feed the Church of God over which (not he himself by his sole Authority as Bishop of the Diocese, but) the Spirit of God had made them *ἑπομενους* Overseers—— I will not here dispute what these Elders of the Church were, though *St. Hierome* tells me they were the Bishops of *Asia*, who I suppose might better know than any that lives in our age. I would here ask our Animadvertor, whether *St. Paul* did not constitute these several Elders over the several Churches, by laying hands on them, and appointing them to their work? I hope he doth not believe that the Spirit of God did in some visible and extraordinary manner appoint these Overseers, but that *St. Paul* being filled with the Spirit of God, did appoint them to such a work. If so, what makes this to his purpose? and why should not he believe that our Bishops, though not in so extraordinary manner, are assisted and directed by the Spirit of God to constitute inferiour Priests over the several Parishes, and to hinder those that are erroneous, from infecting them? I am confident our Animadvertor doth believe, that the Ministers of his party are assisted by the Spirit in their preaching; why not our Bishops in their governing? Now that this must be the meaning of the place, I think may very probably be educed out of *St. Paul's* summoning them to him to *Miletus*, in his charging them to perform their duty, &c in his freeing himself from the guilt of the blood of any of them, if they miscarried, which he needed not have done, if he had not constituted them there.

2. His second Proof is out of *St. Peter*, wherein he commands his fellow Elders to feed the Flock which was amongst them, *ἑπομενους* Overseers, acting like Bishops, and not like the Bishop of *Worcester*, as lording over Gods Heritage, but as Patterns of the Flock.—— So he. What is gathered from this? Ergo the Bishop of *Worcester* is not chief Pastor of all the Parishes in his Diocese. I confesse, I am not quick sighted enough

enough to see this consequence, Nay, I think it is quite contrary, he bids them feed and oversee the Flock, therefore they were chief Pastors of their Dioceses: for if it be evidently clear, (as I think the Learned Dr. *Hammond* in his exquisite Dissertations hath made sufficiently appear) that Bishops were instituted by the Apostles, then there is no question but that these *ἐπίσκοποι* were the Bishops he speaks to. And this, were it now necessary to shew, is further evinced, both because the Apostle bids them *ἐπιμαρτυρεῖτε* and *ποιμαίνειτε*, two phrases which are generally both in Scripture, and ancient Fathers used particularly to Bishops in our sense: Neither yet am I satisfied why *κατακυριωθήτε τῶν κληρῶν* doth not signify lording over the Clergy, and I believe my Animadvertor can hardly render it better; but this is not now my business.

But to go on, his Inference is as infirm as his Argument: for it doth not follow that because a Bishop and a Presbyter are names sometimes given to one person, therefore as he would seem to intimate, that in the Scripture sense they are one. But with his pardon, though he will find a Bishop sometimes called a Presbyter, as our Earls are called Lords, yet let him shew me a Presbyter called a Bishop, either in Scripture or in ancient Fathers, I am very confident he cannot, till then he hath done nothing.

3. His third Exception is still worse, when he says it seems to be a light, and to say no more, unseemly trifling with Sacred Scripture, to affirm these words of our Saviour concerning such as come not in by the Door, and therefore are Thieves and Robbers, ought to be understood of such as Preach to Congregations without the Bishops Licence. Thus he, And I desire the Reader to judge, whether our Animadvertor deals ingenuously. Where doth my Lord *Worcester* say that he is a Thief and a Robber, that Preacheth without the Bishops Licence? His words are these, That Mr. *Baxter* was neither Parson, Vicar, nor Curate of *Kedermister*, or any where in my Diocese: For he never came in by the Door, that is, by any legal, right, or Lawfull Admission, but climbed up some other way, namely by violence and intrusion, and therefore by Christs own inference is a Thief and a Robber, &c.

And I desire our Animadvertor to tell me, whether he that by an unjust, and usurped Authority comes into another mans freehold, receives the profits thereof, and robs the Owner of his reputation there, is not more a Thief than he that Robs a Purse on the High-way. I believe if *D. E.* had been put out of his Estate for his honesty and loyalty, he would have counted the Possessors of it worse than many that suffer publickly for fitching and stealing. But besides, where doth the Bishop say that he forbade Mr. *Baxter* to Preach, because he did it without his Licence, but because he sowed the seeds of Schism & sedition there? For which cause I thought it my duty (as being their Pastor in Chief) nor

onely to forbid Mr. *Baxter* to Preach any more, which by the way he had done without my License; but, and these are my Lords words, now how strangely doth he report what my Lord sayes? He never sayes he was a Thief and Robber, because he came not in by his License, but because he came in by violence and intrusion.

But further, allowing the Bishop did say so, which he doth not, Can he be said to be come in at the Door, that comes in illegally? I can imagine but two wayes of coming in, either by the Door, or over the Pales, [*Joh. 10.*] which our Saviour mentions, and certainly if he that comes legally in, comes in by the Door, he that comes illegally in, comes over Pale, let our Animadvertor understand it either according to the Municipal Law of the Land, or the Law of the Church, which pleaseth him best.

But let us see his Arguments, why he that Preacheth without the Bishops License doth come in by the Door. His first Argument is, because then he knows not what Ordination signifies.

————— Yes, certainly you do know it gives him Authority to Preach, but not to another mans flock, nor in a Diocese where he hath no charge committed to him. And this was my Lord's Reason, though he sayes the principal reason was because he Preached without his License, and very disingenuously leaves out the following words, having no cure of souls of his own to Preach to. Besides, had he had a flock, my Animadvertor by the last words of his Arguments doth sufficiently justify the Bishops proceeding, when he sayes that moral and notoriously vicious misdemeanors may be a sufficient cause, and this certainly Mr. *Baxter* was guilty of, that Preached Sedition, Rebellion, and Schism, and that hath done what he could to make the King Odious to his people. His second Reason is more strange, for one Minister of the Gospel (for certainly a Bishop is no more) to silence another, and that for no better reason, but because his fellow Minister is desirous to Preach the Gospel without a new Licence, is an abuse of Dominion.

————— I desire the Reader first to mark his Parenthesis, wherein he that said before, he was for the Order of Bishops, now tells us that a Bishop is no more than a single Presbyter. Secondly, he is impartial in saying that the Bishop did silence him, because he did Preach without License, for this is one of the Bishops Reasons, he that reads the Letter will find many more. But thirdly, he contradicts himself, when he sayes the silencing Mr. *Baxter* was an abuse of Dominion, when he confesseth before, that for moral and notoriously vicious misdemeanors he may do it. And whether M. *Baxter* be not much guilty, I am loath for his sake further to enquire. But fourthly, and lastly, allowing all he saith to be true, which I have proved false, that the Bishop did abuse his Dominion in silencing Mr. *Baxter*, doth this prove that what the Bishop saith, that Mr. *Baxter* came not in by the Door, is a trifling with Scripture, when nothing is more

sure

sure, than that he that comes by violence into anothers profession is a Thief and Robber by the Law of God and man? And this is all worth answering in his third Exception.

4. His fourth Exception is this, How consistent with the Civil Peace (for I omit your Parenthesis, since it is nothing but railing) is the Bishops distinction between the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion, when he tells us, that the King by it onely pardoned the Corporal punishment, but the Church had not, nor ought not to forgive the scandal, till honorable amends were made by Confession and Recantation? — And now the Reader may perfectly understand what our Animadvertor is. I confesse, I ever found his party very unwilling to Recant their former miscarriages, I wish to God many were not ready to Justifie what they have done. But till this day was ever there any Christian thought, that the Church had not power over their Members to hinder them from any benefit by her Communion, unless they gave satisfaction for their publique offence and scandal? What was the reason the primitive Christians underwent those severe penances, as the antient Fathers, and several Councils mention, the first 300. years, if they believed not the Church had the power of Censuring? Nay, doth not his own party use them, where ever they have had any power? witness the frequent Excommunications in *Scotland*. But I understand not what he means, by saying, the Bishop makes the Church distinct from the State in coercive Jurisdiction. I know no coercive Jurisdiction the Church pretends to, for certainly to shut people out of her communion, is not a coercive power, to deny the benefit of her communion to notorious Sinners, till they recant and give satisfaction, the Church ever did, before the Magistrate was Christian, and the *Pœnitentes*, then, that stood at the Church porch bewailing their sins, and begging the Churches prayers, did give satisfaction and recant, before ever there was the least shew of coercive power in her. And therefore what this Reverend Prelate saith, is most true, that the King did but pardon the guilt or obligation to punishment, 'tis *Christ's* Deputies the Church must have satisfaction for the scandal and offence. And this is so little inconsistent with the Civil peace, that nothing can conduce more to it, to have men, sensible of their miscarriages, recant and give publick satisfaction, will be our best means to prevent others from sinning so again. I pray God the unwillingness of many to repent here, although the King hath pardoned them their corporal punishment, doth not oblige them to a worse hereafter. And thus I have answered his fourth Exception. For as to the justifying this power in the Church, 'tis not my work, here to do it, and till the Animadvertor hath answered Dr. *Hanmuds* Discourse of the power of the Keys, that power he must as well as I believe in the Church, I have only shewed it very consistent with the Civil peace.

5. His fifth Exception is this. It is bold and impious when he affirms, that if to command an Act which by accident may prove an occasion of sin be sinful, then God cannot command any thing. — I understand not at all the Impiety in this Proposition, for the Bishop understands not this of Gods extraordinary commands, for God may by a new command dispence with his own Law, as in commanding *Abram* to offer *Isaac*, which had been murder had it not been done by Gods command, and *Abram's* intencion had been murderous and sinful, but of his ordinary and common commands. Neither can it be any more Impiety to say, God cannot command any thing, than to say God cannot sin, if *Mr. Baxter's* position be true, and though God by his Almighty power may sometimes and upon extraordinary occasions dispence with his own Law, yet it may be piously enough said, God cannot command the breach of his own Law, because it must be necessarily understood in his ordinary way of Dispensations.

6. His sixth Animadversion is. That in Divinity 'tis false and dangerous to affirm, That an offence unto which a disproportionable penalty is annexed is not to be measured by the quality of the Act considered in it self, but by the mischievous consequences of it. This he takes great exception against, but answers not the Bishops Reasons for it. But let us see what his Arguments are against it. His first is, (to shorten his long Expressions) That for not submitting to trivial Ceremonies, to debar one first from Christian and then from Civil communion, is not justified by Scripture or Primitive Practice. This Argument first is particular, and that is no way argumentative: for though all he should say were true, yet it would amount to no more but to make one Exception against this Rule, and that would rather confirm than weaken it. 2. His Argument is perfectly begging the Question, if he means that for such forbearance they ought not to be forbid the Sacrament, because the penalty is disproportionable. But 3. did neither the Scripture nor Primitive practice justify it, yet if it did not condemn it, were there not the least pretence in either for the practice of it, if it were totally silent in it, there is enough to perswade the Church to do that which is for the benefit of the whole. But as his Reason is weak against this Position, so it is false in it self: for it is much a less inconvenience to debar one from the Sacrament for not kneeling, than to break the peace of the Church by dividing from it, & by infusing into a multitude (which at all times is ready to embrace any novelty) principles of distrusting the commands of their lawful Pastors; and if our Animadvector did but look into the practice of the Primitive Church, he would find scarce any offence was looked upon with a worse Eye, than Schism and separation was, and that they were more
fatal

fatal to the Church, than the hottest Persecution. I need not give Examples for it, he knows enough already. As for the Texts of Scripture that are produced for it, since they are nothing more, but what every Nonconformist produceth for not conformity, and have been so sufficiently answered by the Writers of our party, I omit to answer them, and the rather, because the Reason against this Exception runs us in this Dispute not the Position it self.

7. The seventh Animadversion is, against that Chain of consequences, which the Bishop produceth. From diversity grows dislike, from dislike Enmity, from Enmity Opposition, and from Opposition first Schism and separation in the Church, and then Faction and Sedition in the State, and I would we had not found it so by our own experience, &c. These are my Lord Bishops words, and this he calls a Rope of Sand, having first told us, that for proof of this, he virulently instances in our unhappy times. I shall not here tell our Animadvector, that if he would have looked abroad, he might find other instances besides this of *England*, but let us examine his reasons, why this is a Rope of Sand. His first is, because nothing is so clear, That there hath been, nay, ought to be Diversities in external forms, without any dislike at all as to the person of another. And his reason is, because the Apostles that Preached to the Circumcision, gave the right hand of fellowship unto the Apostles of the Gentiles, although their outward Rites in publique worship were far more different than ours in *Engl.* In answer to this, I say first, That his instance of the Apostles is not at all the same, for though the Churches of the Circumcision, and Churches of the Gentiles were oftentimes in one and the same place, yet they were of different Communions, and this difference did arise not upon indifferent things, but upon things absolutely necessary. For the Churches of the Circumcision did follow Gods positive Command, which as yet they were not convinced were to be buried with Christ, so that the question between them was not concerning the use of external Rites, but whether Gods Command, that injoynd them to the *Jews*, were still in force or no? Secondly, I believe our Animadvector himself doth not count Circumcision an external Rite but something more, since it was an Ordinance of Initiation into the Church of God, and was backed with so severe a penalty, that the Male that was not Circumcised the eighth day, was to be cut off from the people. But thirdly, though the case be not the same, yet what animosities and heartburnings did this difference cause amongst the Christians? was it not the cause of the Council held at *Hierusalem*? *Act. 15.* did it not make *St. Paul* withstand *Peter* to the face? *2 Gal. 1. 1.* and how many divisions in after ages did this difference produce? as particularly the keeping of *Easter* on the Jewish day of Paschever by the Eastern Church

Church, to name no more, so it appears evidently, the Church was never free from animosities, till the Jewish Rites were quite laid aside, and the whole Church became Christian, that is, followed one and the same Rites. I say not this, I would not be mistaken, that the whole Church universal, ought to follow one Rite, but I say, 'tis necessary to the peace of the Church, that every particular National Church follow hne and the same Rites.

His 2. Reason for his Animadversion, is because the State may be preserved without the least reference to the Church. And this I suppose he directs particularly against the last words of my L. Bishops chain of consequences, first Schism in the Church, then sedition in the State. And truly no man can think this an ill inference, that considers the Doctrine of taking up Arms for Religion, that considers this hath not been only generally taught, but by most of their party believed as a great truth. But his Argument herein is faulty to, for though the State did subsist without any reference to the Christian Church, did it not produce most horrible Murthers, and bloodsheddings of the most loyallest of its Subjects? neither is the Reason good, because a Heathen State was preserved without reference to the Christian Church, therefore a Christian may without reference to a Christian Church: for these States had still a Church, though not of Gods, which their Laws and Constitutions had reference to, and without which 'twas impossible to have kept Government in that order. But lastly, though 'tis possible a State may be preserved without reference to the Church, can it prudently be done, and is it likely to hold long, since Religion hath upon many people a greater force than any Law. I am sure, since the World was Christian there was never such an Example.

His third Argument is, because Unity doth not depend upon Uniformity, but upon Chariry. And of this he gives no Reason, but his *ipse dixit*, unless giving the Bishop ill words be a Reason. I hope our Animadvertor can distinguish between Unity amongst Individuals, and Unity with a whole body, for though the first consists in Charity and candid forbearance, this latter can only visibly consist in Uniformity, and can only appear, in every person then joyntly assembled using one and the same Rite. The heart, no man can see, and I believe let men never so well agree in their hearts, that only which makes this agreement visible is their observing one and the same Rite openly. And so I have answered this Reason also, if it may be so called.

To follow him, his eighth Animadversion is. Whether as to the Matter of Fact, the *French* Protestants do enjoin standing, and the *Lutherans* kneeling. This he believes not upon the Bishops saying so, but he hath more reason to believe it than the contrary, since the practice of all those places do testify it, for it is hardly possible to believe, that people are more willing to obey the Church, without Laws to back her, than with Laws, unto which a penalty is annexed. Our Animadvertor here falls from this matter of Fact, and

and disputes concerning the *Jure* of prescribing such Laws. Now that is quite from the business here in hand, this Reverend Prelate urgeith it as a good Argument that our Church may enjoyn Rites and Ceremonies as well as the *French, Dutch, and Lutheran*, he should shew Reasons why our Church may not do it as well as others do, But he runs into another Dispute, unto which I will not follow him, since all this and stronger Objections are every where answered, by our Writers, who have undertaken to handle this Controversy, as Mr. *Hooker*, the late Lord Bishop of *Durham*, and others.

9. His last Animadversion is an accusation of the Bishop of Uncharitableness, because he sayes *Crimine ab uno — Disce omnes*, as if he did revile all the Presbyterian party, by reason of Mr. *Baxter*. I will repeat you the Bishops words. You have before seen the Ingenuity and veracity, you now see the Humility and modesty of the man, and in proportion of the whole party. Now this is but a taxing the Party but in proportion, and I would to God, what here is said, was not too true. Besides, this hath reference only to the humility and modesty of the man, the other particularly belongs to Mr. *Baxter*, as to the occasion of the Bishops Letter, and then are not all the party guilty, of counting it unlawful for our Church, to impose Rites, as others have done? and is it not a piece of arrogancy and immodesty for inferiour Clergy to say this both of Church and State. But besides, were this not allowable in the Bishop, how comes our Animadveror in the same breath to be guilty of the same Crime? and though he begins it with a Rhetorical flourish, Would his Brethren the Bishops take it well of a Presbyterian to cry *Crimine ab uno — Disce omnes*. See what manner of Spirits these Bishops are of, and judge them all by the Bishop of *Worcester's* Example, yet we may see easily through it, and perceive the height of uncharitableness, when he prays God to deliver us from such Bishops.

And I now have done with these Animadversions, and I am glad, as *D. E.* is, that the World is not easily gulled with 'Αυτοψία, and then I am sure what he hath said will be to no mans prejudice but his own, Yet I must follow him in that which he calls a Taste of the Bishops wisdom, and I am afraid the Reader will find little of that in the Animadveror.

1. His first is, That the Bishop saith, they did force all Communicants to be examined before they admitted them to the Sacrament — And this he calls a man of Straw for the Bishop this weather to get him heat with, and why, because the custom was to have one but once examined. Why doth the Bishop say that a man was to be examined every time before he received? I find it not any where, and yet I have carefully read the Letter. Besides, he is much out in thinking that Catechizing and instructing the people before they received is all one with Examining, for the first purs the Receiver in a capacity to examin himself, the other like Auricular confession, disco-

discovers to the Priests, the thoughts of the Receivers hearts. But since our Animadverſor juſtifies not this, I ſhall ſay no more againſt it.

Secondly, I do not underſtand, why he ſhould be angry at the Biſhops ſpeaking againſt the Covenant; and not againſt Mr. *Baxter* for Preaching for it, ſince it was burnt. And with his Pardon this Reverend Prelate did with a Chriſtian Zeal, deſire thoſe books ſhould be burnt that were Printed in defence of it, ſince it continues deluded people in their Errors, and inſuſeth in them that ungodly Principle of taking up Arms for Religion.

Thirdly, But laſtly, I underſtand not why he is angry the Biſhop will write no more, when really, neither this Reverend Prelate nor any elſe needed to have done it; unleſs there were ſtronger exceptions brought againſt this Letter than are by our Animadverſor. And whether the *Philiftins* will thank this Biſhop for fighting, I am ſure the *Preſbyterians* have little reaſon to do it, when their *Goliaths* do fall before him. But why the Venerable Age of this Prelate, his forein Travels, or rather baniſhment for a good a Conſcience, ſhould make our Animadverſor ſport, I know no reaſon for it, unleſs it be the ſame, that induc'd him to make *Bradſhaw* his Patron, and to commend him in Print as his very good Lord.

And now I have answered all but his railing, and that I ſhall onely do in our Saviours rule, in praying for them that curſe us, and deſpightfully uſe us. I have nothing more to ſay, but that though the Biſhop by other great affairs, had no leaſure to conſider ſuch Diſcourtes as this is, yet I that have more leiſure will promiſe him to answer what he ſayes, provided he keeps ſtrictly to the buſineſſe in hand, for if he runs out, to diſpute of the power of the Keys, of the lawful uſe of Indifferent things, and ſuch like controutſies, I ſhall hardly find leiſure to follow him, and I am ſure there is already that ſaid for them which neither he nor his party can answer.

FINIS.

Hand Made

6d. per yard

26808

2 1/2 in. Border to match

3/- per piece

26818

TRADE MARK

